REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-11, 14-24 and 26-36 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Entry of Amendment

Applicants submit that the entry of the present Amendment is proper, since it is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that the entry of this Amendment as well as the Amendment of August 1, 2006 is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs

Claims 26-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. These rejections have been answered in the previous Amendment of August 1, 2006. The Examiner is referred to that Amendment for an answer to these rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-18, 20-24, 26-30 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Berger et al. (U.S. Patent 6,528,145) in view of Nishide et al. (U.S. Patent 5,827,605) and Zak (U.S. Patent 6,006,427). Claims 6, 19 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Berger et al., Nishide et al. and Zak and further in view of Czjakowski et al. (U.S. Patent 6,613,978). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Application No. 10/619,591 Amendment dated August 9, 2006 After Final Office Action of February 9, 2006

By way of the present Amendments, Applicants have now added limitations to independent claims 1 and 14. In each case, the bonding layer is now defined as having vias formed therein. Applicants submit that the combination of references suggested by the Examiner do not teach this limitation. The Berger et al. reference uses a ball grid array to connect the inorganic substrate with the print circuit board. Vias are not present in the bonding layer, to the extent that Berger et al. shows such a layer. Further it would not be obvious to include such vias since the ball grid array would include large spaces between the balls and the via would not be in contact with anything beyond the bonding layer.

The Nishide et al. reference has been cited to teach an inorganic substrate having a passive component formed thereon. Applicants submit that the bonding layer having vias is not taught in this reference either. The user relies on Zak to teach that printer circuit boards can be organic. This reference also does not teach this concept.

The Examiner cited Czjakowski et al. to teach a plurality of circuit boards formed on a ceramic substrate. Applicants submit that this reference also does not teach the concept of the vias formed in the bonding layer. Since none of these references teach this concept, Applicants submit that both claims 1 and 14 and the dependent claims which depend therefrom are all allowable.

Furthermore, the Applicants refer to the arguments presented in the Amendment of August 1, 2006, to show other reasons why these references do not teach the present claimed invention as presented before the current Amendment. These arguments still apply since that language has not been removed.

Application No. 10/619,591 Amendment dated August 9, 2006 After Final Office Action of February 9, 2006

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295 at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

A three-month Extension of Time was previously submitted on August 1, 2006.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant